

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

In the application as examined, claims 1 - 38 and 223 - 249 are pending. Claims 39 - 222 were previously cancelled.

In the present response, claims 1, 8, 19 and 227 are amended. Claims 2 - 7, 9 - 18, 20 - 38, 223 - 226 and 228 - 249 are unchanged. Claims 250 and 251 are added.

Support for new claim 250 is found, inter alia, in paragraph [0028] of the application as published (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0146063). Support for new claim 251 is found, inter alia, in paragraph [0197] of the application as published.

Claims 1 - 9 and 26 - 38 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barone (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,437) in view of Grant et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,033) and Kotlicki (U.S. Patent No. 6,211,522).

Claims 10 - 25, 223 - 234 and 237 - 249 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barone (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,437) in view of Grant et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,033).

Claims 235 - 236 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barone (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,437) in view of Grant et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,033) and further in view of Kotlicki (U.S. Patent No. 6,211,522).

Barone describes a passive infrared detection system which has a wide angular field of view and a flat or nearly flat front surface. Input optical elements direct and/or focus incident peripheral infrared radiation onto one or more internal Fresnel lens arrays and/or a

sensitive area of a detector, including radiation having incident angles of less than about 30 degrees.

Grant describes a passive infra-red detection apparatus including an infrared sensor array mounted in a housing and a focusing reflector system and focusing refractor which focus infra-red radiation from different distance ranges onto the sensor array. The sensor array includes at least three sensing elements or groups of elements spaced apart transversely with respect to the lens axis of the focusing refractor.

Kotlicki describes an infra-red lens array for use in a passive infra-red intrusion sensor, which maintains high detection capability for intruders moving in the middle and near field, and yet discriminates well between the movement of intruders and of pets in the near field.

As noted above, claim 1 stands rejected based on the combination of Barone, Grant and Kotlicki.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly define the passive infra-red detector of the present invention. Claim 1 now includes the recitation "each of said at least three fields-of-view extending over no more than 45 degrees in azimuth."

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art, either alone or in combination, shows or suggests the passive infra-red detector as recited in amended claim 1, including, inter alia, "each of said at least three fields-of-view extending over no more than 45 degrees in azimuth." Amended claim 1 is therefore patentable.

Additionally, in the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner writes:

"Regarding claim 1 ... Barone is silent with regards to a 30 degree gap between at least one of the three sub fields-of-view ... Grant discloses a passive infra-red detector comprising: wherein at least three sub fields-of-view

are separated by a gap of less than 30 degrees” (Office Action, last two lines of page 2 and first four lines of page 3)

“Thus, it would have been obvious to modify Barone to arrange the sub fields-of-view with a gap ..., as taught supra by Grant ...” (Office Action, page 3, lines 14 - 16)

Applicants note that amended claim 1 recites, inter alia, “each of the at least three sub fields-of-view **being exclusively defined by an optical element which does not define any other of the at least three sub fields-of-view.**” (emphasis added) Applicants note that the arrangement of the optical elements of Grant does not meet this limitation, as the optical elements in Grant each define a number of sub fields-of-view. This is clearly seen, inter alia, in Fig. 6 of Grant. Thus, the detector of amended claim 1 would not be rendered obvious by the combination of Barone and Grant.

As noted above, claim 10 stands rejected based on the combination of Barone and Grant. The Examiner writes:

“Barone is silent with regard to the processing circuitry is operative to process the output signals in time periods. Grant discloses ... noting, within a predetermined first time period (time interval), multiple detections by one of the at least two sub-detectors and the absence of detection by another of said at least two sub-detectors and being operative to ignore future detections by the one of the at least two sub-detectors for at least a predetermined second time period (col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 12).” (Office Action, page 5, lines 13 - 22)

Applicants respectfully disagree. Grant does not disclose processing circuitry as recited in claim 10. Claim 10 recites, inter alia, signal processing circuitry, ... noting, within a predetermined first time period, multiple detections by one of said at least two sub-detectors and the absence of detections by another of said at least two sub-detectors and **being operative to ignore future detections by said one of said at least two sub-detectors for at least a**

predetermined second time period.” As discussed further below, Grant does not show or suggest ignoring future detection of a sub-detector. Claim 10 is therefore patentable.

Applicants note that the time interval referenced in the processing circuitry of Grant is a time interval the processor waits between detection of a first motion signal by a first sub-detector and detection of a second motion signal by a second sub-detector. In contrast, the predetermined first time period referenced in the processing circuitry of the detector recited in claim 10 is a time period during which multiple detections are recorded by a first sub-detector at the same time interval during which no detections are recorded by a second sub-detector. In response to this condition, the processing circuitry is operative to ignore future detections by the first sub-detector for a second time period. As discussed above, Grant does not show or suggest processing circuitry with such functionality.

Thus, the first and second predetermined time periods recited in claim 10 are not the time interval described by Grant, which is merely the time interval between detection by the first sub-detector and the second sub-detector.

Claim 8 is amended to depend from new claim 250. Claims 19 and 227 are amended to provide proper antecedent basis for all elements recited therein.

Claims 2 - 9, 15 - 38 and 250 - 251 each depend directly or ultimately from claim 1 and recite additional patentable subject matter and are therefore patentable. Claims 11 - 14 and 223 - 249 depend directly or ultimately from claim 10 and recite additional patentable subject matter and are therefore patentable.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant : Kotlicki, et al.
Serial No. : 10/596,695
Filed : September 3, 2008
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 28103-0006US1

Please apply any necessary charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050,
referencing the above attorney docket number. Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2011

/S. Peter Ludwig/
S. Peter Ludwig
Reg. No. 25,351

Customer Number 26211
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945